

SCIPIO TETTIUS AND THE LATIN CLASSICS

— JUSTIN STOVER —

ABSTRACT

Scipio Tettius (d. ca. 1571) is not a household name amongst classical scholars. Nonetheless, his most important work, the Index auctorum nondum editorum, written in 1553, attempts for the first time to describe the extent of classical literature which survived transmitted in manuscripts, but which had yet to appear in print. This study provides the most comprehensive treatment yet available for Tettius' life and career, and, focussing on the Latin works in his list, situates his achievement as an important landmark in the history of classical scholarship.

KEYWORDS

Scipio Tettius, Philippe Labbe, Pierre Pithou, Claude Dupuy, manuscripts, Cardinal Angelo Mai

In the spring of 1554, Gelenius died in Basel.¹ A Bohemian humanist and polymath, born Zikmund Hrubý z Jelení in Prague, he had laboured for thirty years in the printing house of Froben at Basel. Largely through his efforts, the press had become one of the foremost in Europe in the publication of ancient texts. Gelenius was a corrector of other people's books, collaborating with more famous scholars who published with Froben, such as Erasmus and Beatus Rhenanus. He also published editions of his own, both Latin and Greek. On the Latin side, he published the *editio princeps* of Theodorus Priscianus in 1532, one of the two 1533 editions of Ammianus Marcellinus to print the final books of his history, and another first edition, the anonymous *De rebus bellicis* along with related ancient works in 1552. His 1550 Tertullian included three new tracts: *De monogamia*, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, and *De resurrectione mortuorum*. On the Greek side, he was the first to put some of Stobaeus into print in 1532; he published the *editio princeps* of a whole corpus of *periploi*, including those of the Carthaginian Hanno and

¹ I would like to thank Dmitri Levitin and Ian Maclean for the invitation to the colloquium for which I first put these ideas together, and Noel Malcolm, Gavin Kelly, George Woudhuysen, and Jarett Welsh for comments on various drafts. On Gelenius, see most recently, M. Vaculínová and A. Truhlář, "Zikmund Hrubý z Jelení a Jeho Život v Basileji," *Listy filologické* 135 (2012), 91–124.

Arrian, in 1533. In 1544, he put out the first edition of the original Greek of Josephus' *Opera*. Though uncredited, he may have also been responsible for the 1533 *editio princeps* of Diogenes Laertius.²

The years around Gelenius' death mark a generational shift in classical scholarship. Erasmus had died less than twenty years before in 1536, and Beatus Rhenanus less than ten in 1547. After Gelenius, no scholar for more than two hundred years would build a reputation on the publication of multiple first editions of classical texts. In these same decades, some of the luminaries of sixteenth century scholarship were born: Pierre Daniel in 1531, Pinelli in 1535, Pithou in 1539, Scaliger in 1540, Lipsius in 1547, Schott in 1552, De Thou in 1553, and Casaubon in 1559. The difference between these two generations of scholars is substantial. Whereas Gelenius' legacy rested on the edition of texts or parts of texts not previously available in print, the lasting contribution of this later generation of scholars is the improvement of texts, either through identification and use of superior manuscripts or through conjectural restoration.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are in some ways a golden age of classical scholarship, populated by intellectual forces whose names editors still conjure with, and whose legacy continues to inspire debate and discussion: Scaliger, Casaubon, Gruter, Gronovius, Heinsius, Bentley. Without prejudice to the singular accomplishments of each of these scholars, the Carlylean approach to the history of Classical scholarship — still dominant from Wilamowitz, Sandys, and Pfeiffer — obscures some of the broader trends in the development of the study of antiquity.³ It also implicitly perpetuates the old medieval idea of the *translatio studii*, where learning passed from Greece to Rome to France; the second generation of humanists would add a further journey to Italy.⁴ Historians of Classical scholarship trace a further return of (now specifically classical) learning from Italy to France to the Low Countries to England to Germany, in general succession though with various permutations. Alternatives are conceivable. One could just as well define the period from Petrarch to Lachmann in terms of the material modalities of engaging

² See the introduction to Tineke L. ter Meer's edition of Erasmus' *Apothegmata* (Leiden 2010), 1.18–19.

³ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *History of Classical Scholarship*, trans. A. Harris, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones (Baltimore 1982) and *Geschichte der Philologie, mit einem Nachwort und Register von Albert Henrichs* (Stuttgart 1998); J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 3 vol. (Cambridge 1903–8); and R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vol. (Oxford 1968–76).

⁴ On *translatio studii*, see K. Sarah-Jane Murray, *From Plato to Lancelot: A Preface to Chrétien de Troyes* (Syracuse 2008).

with texts, sketching in broad terms an ‘Age of Manuscript Hunting’ from Petrarch to Poggio, or 1350–1450, an ‘Age of Publishing’ from 1450–1550, an ‘Age of Cataloguing,’ from 1550 to 1650, an ‘Age of Criticism’ from 1650–1750, and at last an ‘Age of Editing’ from 1750 to 1850. This approach, even were it to be refined from these crude outlines, would still obscure as much as it would reveal, as does the prevailing biographical approach. What it would bring to the fore, however, are the progressive forces behind the accumulation of classical scholarship which permitted individual geniuses like Scaliger and Bentley to emerge. It would also permit discussion of minor figures who have left us no valuable legacies we engage with today, and whose contributions — such as they were — were forgotten within decades of their deaths.

One more preliminary is required. It is useful (and virtually unavoidable) to periodize the history of classical scholarship, and in many ways these periods do correspond to actual historical facts. It is simply true that by the middle of the sixteenth century, most of the classical texts transmitted in manuscripts had been published. For Latin, that happened even earlier: almost no major new classical authors were published after 1520, which saw the *editiones principes* of Velleius Paterculus, Rutilius Namatianus, and Calcidius. But no one knew that at the time. After all, hundred of authors were mentioned by the likes of Gellius and Nonius Marcellus, authors dearly loved by humanists. There was no *a priori* reason to assume that patience and diligence in manuscript hunting would not conjure them up for an eager audience. Only slowly did hopes of a total recovery of antiquity fade.

In this study I would like to draw attention to a little text written perhaps as Gelenius was dying, which illustrates in concrete terms the shift in the way the transmitted corpus of Latin literature was understood, and at the same time is one of the first documents which admits the finitude of surviving ancient literature. The *Index librorum nondum editorum* was composed by an obscure Neapolitan patrician and mediocre scholar, Scipio Tettius (Scipione Tetti or Theti), in 1553 or 54. It is a short alphabetical catalogue of Latin and Greek works which had not yet been edited, with some indication (for most of them) of which libraries contained copies. The author and the work are equally obscure, so here we will seek to illuminate both in succession. First, the author.

Little is known of Tettius’ life.⁵ We at least know his brother Carlo Tetti was born in Nola in 1529, and their father was the Neapolitan patrician Francesco Tetti. The first we hear of Scipio is in the 1555 *editio*

⁵ There is a brief discussion of the testimonia to Tettius in Leonardo Nicodemo’s *Addizioni copiose* to Toppi’s *Bibliotheca Neapolitana* (Naples 1683), 227–8.

princeps of Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* by Benedetto Egio, which uses a codex Tettianus and contains a discourse on the various figures named Apollodorus written by Tettius himself, dedicated to the cardinal Otto Truchsess.⁶ Around this time, he was in the service of Piero Vettori in Florence and Venice, and figures several times in the correspondence of Ottavio Pantagato throughout the late 1550s and 60s, at one point in conjunction with Carlo, at another as a *homo amabilissimo et virtuoso*.⁷ In 1560, Giulio Poggiano mentions him in a letter to Davanzati:

De Tectio, minime tecto, quid quaeris? valet & illam suam securitatem
ac libertatem retinet.⁸

Aldo Manuzio the Younger also mentions him in the preface to his 1563 edition of Sallust, noting that he was endowed with *singulari quadam in peruestigandis ueterum libris diligentia*.⁹ He is also mentioned in a poem by Achilles Statius written ca. 1564 (ll. 49–50):

Quique potest unus scriptores Tettius omnes
Edere, quos aetas illa vel illa tulit.¹⁰

⁶ Technically, this is preceded by a letter from Tettius to Piero Vettori dated 9 January 1554, in BL Add. MS 10278; cf. R. Mouren, "La lecture assidue des classiques: Marcello Cervini et Piero Vettori," in P. Gilli, ed. *Humanisme et église en Italie et en France méridionale (XVe siècle-milieu du XVIe siècle)* (Rome 2004), 433–63 at 459; and *Iter IV*, 88. Ottavio Pantagato claims to have known Tettius for *sedece o dicidotto anni*, sixteen or eighteen years, in a letter to Vettori, dated 1566, which would take us back to 1548 at the earliest; see A. Soler i Nicolau, *La correspondència d'Ottavio Pantagato (1494–1567)* (PhD. Diss. Barcelona 2000), 338. I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewer who pointed me to Pantagato's letters.

⁷ *Ep.* 130, p. 338 Soler i Nicolau and *Ep.* 100, p. 276 Soler i Nicolau.

⁸ *Julii Poggiani Sunensis Epistolae et orationes olim collectae ab Antonio Maria Gratiano ...* (Rome 1752) ep. 109 (vol. 2, 187–8).

⁹ J. T. Welsh and J. Hill, "A Neglected Manuscript of the Glossary of Placidus and the History of the Text," *Classical Quarterly* 71 (2021), 422–39 at 437. His name is misspelled *Pettius*.

¹⁰ See J. Ijsewijn, "Achilles Statius: A Portuguese Latin Poet in late 16th Century Rome," *Humanitas* 43–4 (1991–2), 109–23 at 117. Ijsewijn, ad loc., claims that Paolo Manuzio mentions Tettius in *Epist.* 7.14 dated 1566 to Antonio Merula, as friends with Statius and Davanzati. I cannot find his name, however, in any published versions of that letter, but Paolo did know Tettius, cf. however, Luigia Ceretta, "Critica testuale a Terenzio in una lettera del Faerno a Paolo Manuzio," *Aevum* 28 (1954), 522–51 at 535. On this poem see also Alejandra Guzmán Almagro, "Consideraciones sobre el poeta laudatório de Aquiles Estaço e vários humanistas," *Humanitas* 54 (2002), 319–32.

This is undoubtedly a reference to the *Index librorum nondum editorum*. That he had a fondness for books has been documented. Not only was he friends with collectors like Stadius and librarians like the Farnese curator and Vatican librarian Panvinio, but in Pantagato's letters, we find him actually compiling lists of Greek works. In 1566, he borrowed from Latino Latini the catalogue of a dispersed private library and returned it two years later.¹¹ Not all of his borrowing was as successful. Apparently at one point, Fulvio Orsini had sent a *libro rarissimo* to Muretus through Tettius; ten years went by — during which time Tettius died — and the book was found with Davanzati. Orsini was upset by Tettius' duplicity, since he had always claimed that the book had been delivered to Muret.

Mi dispiace haver a dire male dei morti, ma in effetto io ho trovato che quel Theti et il Avanzati in materia di libri havevano la coscienza fatta a lor modo, et un mio libro rarissimo che havevo gia prestato dieci anni sono al Mureto per le mani del Theti, ho trovato hora nelli libri dell' Avanzati, con tutto che io me ne sia doluto molte volte con l'uno e col l'altro, ma particolarmente col Theti, il quale mi diceva sapere che'l Mureto havea quel libro tralli suoi, con tutto che affermasse havermelo restituito, siche tutto questo tempo son stato in quest'errore et resentimento ancora in qualche occasione contra il Mureto. Ho poi trovato che [...] alla sua morte (del Theti), l'havea fatto suo l'Avanzatus con molti altri di esso Theti che ho poi ritrovato in questo numero de libri, et hanno verificato il proverbio che un barbiere rade l'altro.¹²

This letter was dated 5 June 1573, which means that the event mentioned could have happened no later than 1563, perhaps around 1561.¹³ But

¹¹ Welsh and Hill, "A Neglected Manuscript," 437 n. 68, citing G. Mercati, *Note per la storia di alcune biblioteche romane nei secoli XVI–XIX* (Vatican City, 1952), 122 n. 2.

¹² Fulvio Orsini to Pinelli, printed from Milan, Ambros. D. 422 by Pierre de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris 1887), 90. Pace de Nolhac, Davanzati is not Bernardo Davanzati (d. 1606) but Francesco Davanzati, about whom we know very little. He is mentioned in the letter of Paolo Manuzio cited above, and we also have a letter sent from Venice on 10 August 1555 to Cardinal Sirlet, extant in Vat. lat. 6189, and printed by Graziano and Lagomarsini in their notes to Poggiano, ep. 109, cited above. There is also poetry by Davanzati extant in Parma Pal. 555, 668–9; see *Iter* 36–7.

¹³ This completes the references to Tetti. It is possible that he is the Scipione mentioned in a letter by Antonio Casario in Rome to Aldus Manutius the Younger written in 1565; see M. Koortbojian, "A Little-Known Manuscript, an Unpublished Letter to Aldo Manuzio il Giovane, and a Long-Forgotten Humanist-Antiquarian: Antonio Casario," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 46 (2001), 133–52 at 150. The letter is preserved in Vat. lat. 5327, ff. 327r–328r.

Tettius has the misfortune of being remembered more for the manner of his demise than for anything he did in life. We know this because Jacques-Auguste de Thou, at twenty years of age, accompanied the ambassador Paul de Foix to Italy in 1574. In Rome, he met Muret himself.

Ab eo, de Scipionis Tettij Neapolitani casu cognovit, hominis, vndecumque vt ille aiebat doctissimi, qui delatus quod male de numine sentiret, remo mancipatus fuerat, et tunc an adhuc in viuis esset incertus esset.¹⁴

Muret went on to lament the fates of other unfortunates: Aonio Paleario, executed in 1570, and Niccolò Franco, likewise executed in 1570. A curious combination: Aonio Paleario was found guilty for his theological affinities to Protestantism (*nimia in pietate simplicitas* is Muret's kind way of putting it) and Niccolò Franco, otherwise famous as a pornographer, for seditious libel in league with Alessandro Pallantieri (one could say *ob invisam coelo Romano in sermocinando libertatem* with Muret).¹⁵ Whatever the truth of the matter, posterity would remember Tettius as the gentle scholar of Apollodorus who was sentenced to the galley. Adrien Baillet in his *Jugemens des Savans* (1685–6, tom. I, 403) paints a picture in pathos:

Tetti avait employé plusieurs années a son petit Traité des Apollodores, avant qu'on l'envoyât aux galères. C'est un Ouvrage de deux feuilles.

Tettius' treatise actually comprises eleven leaves in the *editio princeps*, but it is an impressive piece of scholarship.¹⁶ There is, however, nothing in it which suggests particularly freethinking approaches to theology, nor of course could there be anything objectionable in the jejune *Index librorum*. This is all that Tettius published. There is nothing in them to substantiate (De Thou's recounting of) Muret's claim. But what we do see is a man of *libertas* — whatever Poggiano meant by the term, it is surely significant that it is addressed to Davanzati. *Un barbiere rade l'altro*, as Orsini wrote, suggesting that both Tettius and Davanzati were a little too *liber* with other people's possessions.

Perhaps he was possessed of a little bit of Franco's kind of *libertas* as well. Giovanfrancesco Ferrari in 1570 dedicated one his *Rime burlesche*

¹⁴ *Commentariorum de vita sua libri sex* [1621], p. 13.

¹⁵ On the Franco affair, see also N. Badaloni, *Inquietudini e fermenti di libertà nel Rinascimento italiano* (Pisa 2004), 53–89.

¹⁶ See for example L. Canfora, *Il Fozio ritrovato. Juan de Mariana e André Schott* (Bari 2001), 61–5.

to Tettius.¹⁷ Another of these burlesques is dedicated to Franco. In point of fact, the last we hear of Tettius on dry land, so to speak, is in the trial and interrogation of Franco himself.¹⁸ At this time, Tettius was apparently in the retinue of the Conte de Alife. He was interrogated on 5 September 1569, and again on the 13th and 28th of the same month. The following year, 1570, he was interrogated on 11 and 15 February and tortured on the 27th, and interrogated a final time on 7 March. Four documents signed by him are extant in the *Constituta et examina* of the case extant in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Misc, Arm. IX, t. 55, ff. 171, 173, 177, and 181). Tettius admitted that Franco had read parts of the libellous book to him around 1561.¹⁹ Incidentally, it is from these interrogations that we find that Carlo Tetti was Scipione's brother, and that they had another brother hanged under Paul IV, probably in 1564.²⁰ Tettius also took responsibility for politically indelicate (and poetically disastrous) doggerel of his own, such as this *pasquinata* about Paul IV:

Se ci è Dio che pur ci è si vede et sente,
 et s'ordini da la sua, legge e misura,
 dunque pensier non ha, dunque non cura
 quel che falli quaggiù la bassa gente.
 Poi che pose in sua vece un rio serpente
 Un mostr'horrend'e sozzo di natura
 Un'aperta de vitii sepoltura
 Un pervers'un malign, un insolente
 [et cetera].²¹

Following his final interrogation, it is very likely that he was shipped off to the galley either that year or the year following. Both Franco and Paleario — whom Muret mentioned with Tettius — were executed in 1570. Being condemned to the oar is not the normal punishment for heretics or libellous scholars, but it may well reflect the unique conditions of 1570–1, when Pope Pius V's primary goal was the strengthening of Christian naval power in the Mediterranean against the Turks, leading up to the

¹⁷ *Le Rime Burlesche, Sopra Varii, Et piaceuoli soggetti; indirizzate à diuersi nobili Signori* (Venice 1570), cap. 50, “Contra Cicerone, à M. Cicerone,” pp. 105–11. On Ferrari, see C. Lastraioli, “In extremis: la manière burlesque de Giovanni Francesco Ferrari,” *Italique* 16 (2013), 233–57.

¹⁸ The documents of the trial were edited by A. Mercati, *I Costituti di Niccolo Franco (1568–170)* (Vatican City 1955).

¹⁹ See Mercati, *Costituti*, 42–3.

²⁰ See E. Bonora, *Roma 1564: La congiura contro il papa* (Bari 2015), n. 31

²¹ See also Badaloni (2004), 88.

victory at Lepanto on 7 October 1571. Under such unique conditions, it may have seemed to the ecclesiastical authorities the ideal solution to rid themselves of an unwanted scholar and get another pair of arms for an oar at the same time.²² Perhaps he did not survive Lepanto. At any rate, Orsini was quite confident he was dead by 1573, even if Muret claimed he was unaware of Tettius' fate in 1574. Carlo was the only survivor from the wreck of the Tettius family. He achieved great distinction as a military engineer, with his 1575 *Discorsi delle fortificationi*, and his work for such notables as William V, Duke of Bavaria, and the Emperor Maximilian II. He died in 1589 and was buried in honour in the basilica of St Anthony in Padua.

The colourful circumstances of Tettius's life, associations, and demise, seem at first glance a poor fit with the aridity of a work like the *Index*. One thread linking them is the love of books. There is no suggestion that Tettius stole from Orsini for gain — it is not as if the rare, and probably valuable, book was sold — but simply because he burned to possess the book. The same theme is echoed in his *De Apollodoris*:

Ego plane his meis adijci posse multa confiteor, nec dubitamus multa esse, quae & nos praeterierint, homines enim sumus, librorumque ac necessariorum copia destitute & novercante fortuna, & urbe Roma (in qua aliud spectatur quam genus, & virtus) aliis occupati : succisivisque temporibus ista curamus.²³

The *Index* is, first and foremost, a monument to bibliomania. But it differs from other contemporary works of bibliography. It is not like Konrad Gessner's pioneering *Bibliotheca universalis* published some eight years before the *Index* (Basel 1545). Gessner's ambition was to bring together all known authors in all languages, without prejudice as to whether their works were transmitted or not. Hence, authors whose works had been printed, authors whose works were still in manuscripts, authors whose works were lost, authors whose names were only known from citations, contemporary authors, medieval authors, ancient authors, all jostle next to each other in Gessner's densely packed pages. The *Index librorum*, by contrast, is a much less erudite and ambitious work. It is also, in one sense, much more useful. It only seems to contain works whose manuscripts Tettius had been apprised of through various means. Aubrey

²² I thank Noel Malcolm for pointing out to me the relevance of the history of the papal navy to Tettius' fate.

²³ Rome 1555, unpaginated.

Diller, in the most thorough study of Tettius' *Index* published to date, locates his enterprise at a very specific moment in the history of print:

The invention of printing was at first regarded as an extension of the copying process; it was not realized that a printed text was in an entirely different state of permanence and availability. Catalogues of the fifteenth century usually list printed books and manuscripts codices indiscriminately. As the use of the press increased, however, the distinction between print and manuscript overshadowed the distinction between originals and copies; and the energies of scholars were absorbed merely in getting classical literature into the new medium.²⁴

I would go yet further. Getting texts from manuscript into print had been the main glory for scholars for fifty years before the index. It was the foundation of Gelenius' Europe-wide fame. And yet, if one had asked a humanist reader in 1500 to list the Latin works which were yet to be printed, it would look quite a bit like Gessner's *Bibliotheca*. It would not look at all like the work Tettius came up with in 1553. I print here the Latin list from a copy written by Dupuy:

Libri Latini nondum editi
 Aproniani comment. in Virgilium.
 Appuleii Minuciani de Orthographia lib. ij. v. a. st.
 Adamantii sive Martyrii de B. muta et V. vocali, liber i.
 Balbi vel Frontini vel Augusti Caesaris et Heronis liber de coloniis.
 Cassiodori de libris instituendis et alia. v. Sirlet.
 Cornelii Frontonis exempla elocutionum, per alfab..
 Epaphroditii et Vitruvii Rufi architectonica . liber i.
 Fulgentii Placidi Virgiliana continentiae liber i.
 Gaudentii sermones.
 Hygeni [*sic*] gromaci liber de munitionibus castrorum.
 Isidori et Ildephonsi de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis libri. v. Ful.
 Iulii Severiani ascitomata artis rhetoricae, lib. i.
 Iunius Philargyrius grammaticus in Virgilium. Flor.
 Placidi grammatici glossae per alphabetum, liber i.
 Plauti Comoedia Philodoxium.²⁵ a.st.
 Plinii Senioris Historiarum lib. xx. Aug. Vin.
 Publilii Optatiani Porphyrii Panegyricus Constantino dicatus.

²⁴ A. Diller, "Scipio Tettius' *Index librorum nondum editorum*," *AJP* 56 (1935) 14–27 at 14.

²⁵ Omitted in the Paris manuscript (and others), supplied at the end, with a caret indicating its placement after Placidus.

Simplicii vel Nynsi vel Ageni de mensuris liber i.
 Trogi Pompei historiarum libri.
 Varronis Liber de arithmetica.
 Velleii Paterculi liber prior integer.
 Velii Longi de orthographia liber i.²⁶

Six out of these twenty-two entries are quite something: Pliny, Varro, Pompeius Trogus, Velleius Paterculus, Plautus, and Apronianus, and will require further discussion. The remaining sixteen represent a fairly a modest lot: some ancient grammarians and rhetoricians, a handful of church fathers, and several technical works. There is no entry for Ennius, or Lucilius, or Livius Andronicus, the lost decades of Livy, no *Consolatio*, or *De Gloria*, or *De Republica* of Cicero, no *Histories* of Sallust. To conceive of this list as comprehensive of the *Libri Latini nondum editi* ca. 1550 is to have a fairly clear-eyed view of Latin literature as it was actually transmitted. Contrast that with the optimism of Aldus Manutius in 1508, reflecting to Alvise Mocenigo, on the occasion of the publication of the tenth book of Pliny's letters:

Solebam superioribus Annis Aloisi Vir. Clariss. cum aut T. Liuii Decades, quae non extare creduntur, aut Sallustii, aut Trogi historias, aut quemvis alium ex antiquis autoribus inventum esse audiebam, nugas dicere, ac fabulas. Sed ... tu è Gallia ... has Plinii epistolas in Italiam reportasti.

When indeed new Livy was found by Simon Grynaeus in 1527 and published in Basel in 1531, Erasmus could claim legitimate hope for even further discoveries:

Utinam faxit Deus Opt. Max. ut hic auctor totus & integer nobis restituatur. Eius rei spem nonnullam praebent rumores per ora quorundam uolitantes: dum hic apud Danos, ille apud Polonos, alius apud Germanos, haberi Liviana quaedam nondum aedita iactitat. Certe posteaquam hasce reliquias praeter omnium spem obiecit fortuna, non video quor desperemus & plura posse contingere.²⁷

To go from the 142 books of the complete Livy to listing works like Adamantius (or Martyrius) on the difference between B and V is a considerable diminishment of expectations. True, Tettius did list the

²⁶ Paris, BNF, Ms Dupuy 651, f. 238r.

²⁷ Ep. Carolo Montoio in Basel 1531.

perennial unicorn of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*, but given the occasionally misleading manuscript headings of copies of Justin's *Epitome*, he may well have heard of what he in good faith thought was a copy. A similar situation obtains with Apronianus. No such commentary survives, although Pomponio Leto does indeed quote such a commentator. The name belongs to Fl. Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius, v. c. et inl., cos. 494, who left a subscription in one of most famous ancient manuscripts of Vergil, the *Mediceus* (BML MS 39.1).²⁸ The Pliny the Elder entry could refer to the twenty books on the German wars mentioned by Pliny the Younger (*ep.* 3.5.4), as it has been interpreted, but Tettius notably does not say that. It could just as well refer to a particular twenty-book copy of the *Historia naturalis*.²⁹ If it does refer to the German wars, the notice could have been copied from Gessner, who claims that a manuscript of that text was at Augsburg (*Augustae Vindeliciorum*). Plautus, of course, wrote no such comedy *Philodoxium*. Leon Battista Alberti, however, as a very young man put into circulation a Plautine comedy under the name of one Lepidus entitled *Philodoxius*. The claim for Varro's *De arithmetica* is not so outlandish as it seems today: in 1517 Andrea Alciato at Milan claimed to have seen a manuscript of the *gromatici* with the title *M. Varro de arithmetica* and Marcus Vertranius Maurus in his *Libellus de vita M. Varronis* published in the Lyon 1563 edition of Varro's *De lingua latina* claimed to have seen a copy of the text at Rome from the library of Cardinal Ridolfi and then owned by Lorenzo Cardinal Strozzi.³⁰

The final surprising Latin entry — that is to say an entry describing a text that we do not think survives — is Velleius Paterculus. Diller was surely correct to associate this entry with a line from 'Gessner': *Vellei Paterculi fragmentum de bello Augusti Caesaris contra Suevos in Noricis et Vindelicia, extat Viennae Austriae apud Vuolffgangum Lazium*. Unfortunately, this is not from Gessner's 1545 *Bibliotheca* but rather from the 1551 update of Gessner by Conrad Lycosthenes, the *Elenchus scriptorum omnium*. This is an important distinction, because in 1551 Wolfgang Lazius published one *Excerptum e Gallica historia*, claiming to have found this *historiam in pervetusto codice membrana literis antiquissimis scriptam dictione plane Caesariana sub titulo Velleji excerpta ex Gallica historia*.³¹ Virtually no one has agreed with

²⁸ Pomponius' quotations are worth further examination.

²⁹ This was already suggested by Antonio Giuseppe della Torre di Rezzonico in his *Disquisitiones Plinianae* (Parma 1763), 153.

³⁰ Ritschl, *Kleine philologische Schriften* (Leipzig 1877), III, 433. Cf. R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci* (Florence 1905), 25–6.

³¹ *Commentariorum reipub. Romanae libri duodecim* (Basel 1551) lib. I . cap . 8 , p . 85

this assessment of the style of the anecdoton, and despite quite a few manuscripts having been discovered, not one of them attributes it to Velleius.³² We can hardly blame Tettius for this slip: Lycosthenes' entry has misled people well into the twenty-first century.³³

While the Greek list may still harbour some items of interest³⁴, the interest of the Latin list is more in its reception history than its contents. Copies of the list trickled out through learned circles across Europe. I know of nine manuscript copies:

Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes MS 1218, ff. 295–8. See the description in A. Bresson, ed. *Lettres à Claude Saumaise et à son entourage: 1620–1637* (Florence 1992), 425.

Carpentras, Bibliothèque Inguimbertaine MS 1769, 295r–302r. Written by Peiresc.

Lanvellec, Bibliothèque de M. le Marquis de Rosanbo, MS 228 (described by D. Muratore, *La biblioteca del Cardinale Niccolò Ridolfi* (Alessandria 2009), I.227–9). Annotated by Pithou.

Leiden, MS Scal. 58b. Owned and annotated by J. J. Scaliger.

Oxford, Bodleian MS Add. A. 176, ff. 216r–222r. Written by Philippe Labbe.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Dupuy 651. Written by Claude Dupuy.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 17917, pp. 400–8. Written by Peiresc.

Vatican City, Vat. lat. 3958, ff. 155r–162v.

Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, H.11958, fourth codicological unit of this miscellaneous manuscript.

³² The use of rhythmical *cursus* rules out Velleius as an author. Even so, one feature the *Excerptum* shares with Velleius is imitation of Sallust. See J. A. Stover and G. Woudhuysen, “*Historiarum libri quinque*: Hegesippus and the *Histories* of Sallust,” *Histos* 16 (2022), 1–27 at 2.

³³ Most recently John A. Lobur, “*Festinatio* (Haste), *Brevitas* (Concision), and the Generation of Imperial Ideology in Velleius Paterculus,” *TAPA* 137 (2007), 211–30 at 218, citing M. Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus ad M. Vinicium Consulem Libri Duo* (Hildesheim 2007), 2 n. 11 and 27 n. 17.

³⁴ See Diller, “Scipio Tettius’ *Index*,” *passim*.

Besides these nine manuscripts, there may be another currently unlocated in Milan which belonged to Pinelli.³⁵ Given the brevity of the *Index* — it is just the sort of text to slip the attention of a weary cataloguer — it probably survives in quite a few more.

Pithou, Dupuy, Labbe, and Scaliger used their copies as scoresheets, so to speak, to keep track of the progress of scholarship, marking texts as they appeared in print. Tettius' Latin *Index* does indeed serve as a fairly reliable predictor of the course of scholarship over the next half century. Some of the *gromatici* were published in Paris in 1554, and more in Leiden in 1607. The first book of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* was published in Antwerp in 1566. Fulgentius, Philargyrius, and Velius Longus were all published together at Heidelberg in 1589. Some excerpts of Gaudentius' sermons were published at Basel in 1569. Hyginus' *Liber* was printed in 1607 at Leiden with Vegetius. Ildephonsus of Toledo was published at Paris in 1576. Severianus was published in 1556 in Basel. Finally, the 'Plautus' was published by Manutius the Younger at Lucca in 1588 as the work of Lepidus, *comicus vetus*. In the Paris manuscript, Dupuy has marked Adamantius, Frontinus, Fulgentius, Isidore, Severianus, Plautus, Philargyrius, Optatian, Simplicius, and Velius Longus with *imp.* (for *impressum*). Similar annotations can be found in the manuscripts of Labbe and Pithou. Peiresc was also a particular enthusiast for Tettius. He commends the *Index* in a letter to Girolamo Aleandro written in April 1617, and it is from this letter that we can date the *Index* to 1553.³⁶ Three of the extant copies are associated with Peiresc: one of the Paris copies, the one in Carpentras, and the one in Aix.

This approach to Tettius' index treats it as a list of items to be marked off; another way to approach it would be to treat it as a minimum to which other texts could be added. After all, it is a curious collection, and certainly there were other texts that could be added. The great Jesuit scholar Jacques Sirmond (1559–1651) composed an updated version of Tettius in 1593, extant in London, BL MS Add. 22039.³⁷ Some of these consisted of more accurate versions of existing entries: he added, for example, *M. Iunii Nynsi de mensuris agrorum liber* where Tettius'

³⁵ A. Nuovo, "Ritratto di collezionista da giovane: Peiresc a casa Pinelli," in M. Fumaroli (ed.), *Peiresc et l'Italie. Actes du colloque international* (Paris 2009), 1–17 at 5–6.

³⁶ The Rosanbo manuscript dates the text to 1554.

³⁷ First identified by P. Petitmengin "Deux 'Bibliothèques' de la Contre-Réforme: le *Panoplie* du Père Torres et la *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum*," in Dionisotti, Kraye, and Grafton, eds. *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays* (London 1988), 127–53 at 127. The manuscript is available online: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add_ms_22039_f039v, last accessed 16.10.21.

original had had *Simplicii vel Nypsi vel Ageni de mensuris liber i*, or *Vitruvii Rufi ex Epaphrodito architectonica* alongside *Epaphrodito et Vitruvii Rufi architectonica. liber i*. In both these cases, Sirmond kept the original in addition to his revision. He also revised the text of individual entries, such as *Gaudentii Brixiani Sermones* or *Trogi Pompei historiarum lib. xliii*. At the end, he added *Eugraphius comment. in Terentium* and *Vetus calendarius*. Intelligent additions — extracts of Eugraphius had been published in Faernus' 1565 edition of Terence, but an independent edition of the commentary would not be printed until Wessner's Teubner of 1908.³⁸ The *Vetus calendarius* is probably the calendar of the *Chronography of 354*; in 1620 Peiresc appropriated the most important manuscript of this text and it disappeared after his death.³⁹

An even more extensive expansion can be found in BAV, Pal. lat. 1952, ff. 1r–6r (s. xvii). This catalogue organizes the much expanded roster of Latin authors (ca. 85, with a few duplicates) by genre under separate headings, i.e. *Grammatici Latini*, *Rhetorica*, *Panegyrici*, *Poetae*, and a catch-all labelled *Ambigui Tituli*.⁴⁰ That some of these entries are based on Tettius is clear from the wording, for example, *Publili Optatiani Porphyrii Panegyricus Constantino dicatus carmine et prosa* and *Hygeni gromaci liber* (f. 1v). At the same time, it excludes ecclesiastical writers entirely (except where they wrote works of secular interest), removing Isidore, Ildefonsus, and Gaudentius from Tettius' list. A number of the entries are underlined and marked in the margin with a forward slash (/).⁴¹

Grammatici Latini
 / Apuleius Minutianus
 / Adamantius sive Martyrius
 / Cornelius Fronto
 / Consultus Fortunatianus
 / Fulgentius Placiades
 / Luctatius Placidus
 / Martyrius sive Adamantius

³⁸ See G. Pezzini, "Eugraphius," in J. A. Stover, ed. *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics* (forthcoming).

³⁹ On this manuscript, see M. Schapiro, "The Carolingian Copy of the Calendar of 354," *The Art Bulletin* 22 (19,40), 270–2. The copy Peiresc commissioned is BAV Barb. lat. 2154.

⁴⁰ I only discuss the Latin list here, but the same principles seem to hold true with the much more extensive Greek list that follows.

⁴¹ One entry, Donatianus, is underlined but not marked.

/ Velius Longus
 Rhetorica
/ Julij Severianj
 Panegyrici
/ Publii optatiani Porphyrii panegyricus Constantino dicatus carmine
et prosa
 Poetae
/ Petronius arbiter
 Ambigui tituli
/ Balbi vel Frontinj de Colonijs
/ Hygeni gromacj liber
/ Junius Nypsus
/ Petronius arbiter
/ Epaphroditi architectonica
/ Vitruvij Rufi architectonica
/ Balbus de ponderibus

All of the entries marked in this way, with the exception of the two appearances of Petronius, are conceivably derived from Tettius. This suggests that the list in Pal. lat. 1952 has a double relationship to Tettius: the *Index librorum* was one of its sources, and was then subsequently cross-referenced against the finished list.

Another way to examine the reception of Tettius' *Index* is to examine its imitations. Immediately following his version of Tettius in the London manuscript, Sirmond provides an index to the unedited patristic texts in the *Hoplotheca* of Turrenianus, which has been studied by Petitmengin.⁴² Almost a century later, Paris sup. gr. 1025 (olim Coislin 352²), from before 1671, transmits a Πίναξ συλλέκτων τινῶν μήπω τετυπωμένων, or *Index quorundam librorum nondum editorum*, a Tettius-style catalogue of unedited works in the library of the Escorial. Of the same library there is also the 1647 *Catalogus praecipuorum auctorum ineditorum* by Alexander Barvoetius, which he extracted from the full catalogue of David Colville, 1601 graduate of St Andrews, and assistant librarian from 1617 to 1625 at the Escorial, and which was printed in the 1648 Antwerp edition of Cyril's homilies.⁴³ Barvoetius is probably one of the sources of the list of unedited works from the Escorial Labbe saw in the hand of Nicolas Rigault (d. 1654), selections of which he printed in the *Nova bibliotheca* (385–6). In 1713, Muratori claimed to have in his possession

⁴² Petitmengin, "Deux 'Bibliothèques'."

⁴³ Colville's catalogue is extant in Madrid, El Escorial, k.i.20 and Milan Ambros. Q 114. Sup. Barvoetius' catalogue may be found conveniently in E. Miller, *Catalogue des Manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque de l'Escorial* (Paris 1848), 511–28.

a manuscript of a *Catalogus librorum nondum editorum* annotated by Lucas Holstenius (d. 1666).⁴⁴ The entry he quotes is very similar to one of Rigault's:

Menegaldus, vel Menengaldus Latinus Historicus: Historia Ecclesiastica. Qui plurima e Trogo Pompejo & Justino quoad profana transcripsisse videtur ...
Cf. Rigault, apud Labb. Menegaldi vel Menengardi Historia Ecclesiastica.

Whoever composed this catalogue tried to combine Tettius' humility with grander dreams. The text referred to seems to be a universal history composed by one Manegold, probably Manegold of Lautenbach, one of the foremost scholars of the eleventh century.⁴⁵ This notice is sufficiently realistic to consider the text one of the many medieval historical works which remained unedited, but bold enough to dream that it may yet offer access to the long-desired text of Trogus. Holstenius himself would have none of it, noting:

Io credo che sia un Manigoldo. Auctor nullius iudicii, nec pretii, quorum centuriae reperiuntur passim in Bibliothecis Monasteriorum, qualis Petrus Comestor, Vincentius Belluacensis, aliique farinae consarcinatores, qui quum nullum suis Historiis initium reperire possent, ab exordio Mundi repetebant.⁴⁶

Undoubtedly there are many such catalogues of unedited works yet to be found and identified. None of those discussed here, however, can be shown to predate that of Tettius. Sirmond's catalogue, at least, seemed to be directly inspired by Tettius' *Index*, and it seems likely that the others owe their inspiration to the same source.

Somewhat ironically, the *Index librorum nondum editorum* remained itself *ineditus* for a full century. Eventually, the Jesuit Philippe Labbe arrested the spread of manuscript copies by printing the *Index* in his 1653 manuscript catalogue, the *Nova Bibliotheca manuscriptorum librorum* (166–74), using the Dupuy manuscript. Labbe recognized that

⁴⁴ Muratori, *Anecdota quae ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae ...* IV, 163. Muratori elsewhere mentions another such catalogue for Vienna (*Rerum italicarum scriptores* VII.524).

⁴⁵ On Manegold, see I. Caiazzo, "Manegold, *modernorum magister magistrorum*," in I. Rosier-Catach (ed.), *Arts du langage et théologie aux confins des XIe–XIIe siècles Textes, Maîtres, Débats* (Turnhout 2011) 317–45.

⁴⁶ Apud Muratori, *Anecdota* IV, 163.

printing the text a century later rendered it a touch anachronistic, qualifying it as containing works *nondum editi tempore saltem eiusdem Tettii*. Indeed, as we have seen, more than half of the works listed had already been published. He is also in the dark as to when the text was written, introducing it as a work written eighty years prior, or in 1573. As we have seen, Tettius was likely dead by that date. While his book was in press, Labbe came across a different manuscript version of the *Index*. Seeing this copy had further entries, Labbe printed the additional entries in the addenda (384–5):

M. Iunij Hypsi de mensuris agrorum liber
 Ildefonsus de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis & Isidorus
 Porphyrii Paneg. Constantino Caesari dictus carmine
 Vitruvii Rufi ex Epaphrodito Architectonica
 Eugraphij Commentarius in Terentium cum Veteri Calendario

This is quite clearly Sirmond's version, even if Labbe does not recognize it as the work of his fellow Jesuit, and some of the misunderstandings seem to result from the peculiarities of the London manuscript. The N in Nypsi looks quite a bit like an H, and the layout of the two additional entries, Eugraphius and the Calendar, side by side could easily lead one into thinking they should be combined. Hence, Labbe must have had access to either the London manuscript or an almost identical copy of it.

At the beginning I noted that Gelenius was the last scholar whose reputation rested primarily on the editing of texts previously unpublished for the next two hundred years. An astute reader might also note that I only dealt with the fate of seventeen of the twenty-two works in Tettius' *Index*. These two facts are interlinked. Latin literature would have a second age of discovery in the nineteenth century, and most of it due to the prodigious output of a single scholar, Angelo Cardinal Mai (1782–1854). In 1822, he fulfilled the dream of the ages preceding him, and presented the scholarly world with the bulk of Cicero's *De republica*, extracted from a palimpsest in the Vatican Library (Vat. lat. 5757). Fragments of Cicero's speeches had preceded this discovery in 1814. In 1815, he brought back to life an author many had thought gone forever, Fronto, the friend and tutor of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Mai found scores of letters as the undertext in a Milan manuscript. Significantly, however, he also included a little work not from a palimpsest, an alphabetical guide to usage using Cicero, Sallust, Virgil, and Terence,

called the *Exempla elocutionis*. This is the *Cornelii Frontonis exempla elocutionum, per alfab.* of Tettius's catalogue, miraculously having escaped being printed entire the previous quarter millennium despite being extant in some thirteen manuscripts.⁴⁷ Unlike the letters, the *Exempla* are not actually by Fronto, but instead by a rhetor named Arusianus Messius, and dedicated to the consuls of the year 395, Olybrius and Probinus. After the edition of the *Exempla*, Mai provides a parergon: two excerpts from works he found in the same manuscript as the *Exempla* (Ambr. D 498 inf., which had belonged to Pinelli). The first is *Adamantii sive Martyrii De b. muta et v. vocali* of which he prints the prologue (pp. 548–9); the second is *Glossae Placidi Grammatici* of which he prints the first three entries and the last (p. 550). Both of these are on Tettius' list, and the manuscript in which Tettius saw the latter has recently been identified.⁴⁸ Martyrius (as the grammarian was actually named) was not printed entire until Keil's edition of 1878.⁴⁹ Mai himself would later go on to provide the editio princeps of Placidus' *glossarium* in 1831.⁵⁰ In 1823, in his *Iuris civilis Antejustinianeae reliquiae ineditae*, Mai published from a manuscript once belonging to Achilles Staius (p. LXXII) one *L. Caecilii Minutiani Apuleii Grammatici De orthographia trium librorum fragmenta* (127–40). This is yet another text in Tettius' *Index: Apuleii Minuciani de Orthographia lib. ij. v. a. st.* The *a. st.* stands for *Achilles Staius*, and so Tettius knew of the same manuscript that Mai would use centuries later (now Rome, Bibl. Vallicelliana R 26). The *v* seems to stand for *Vaticana*, which would imply that Tettius knew of another manuscript not yet identified. Debate has followed this text since Mai published it. Opinion as to its antiquity and authenticity has gone back and forth over the decades. Current consensus seems to regard it as a Renaissance forgery, by Caelius Rhodiginus (Ludovico Ricchieri, d. 1525), the first scholar to cite it.⁵¹ That leaves a single text in Tettius' *Index* unaccounted for: *Epaphroditii et Vitruvii Rufi architectonica*. This text is transmitted partially with other gromatic texts in the Codex Arcerius, but it was not

⁴⁷ See J. A. Stover, "Arusianus Messius," in *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics* (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ See Welsh and Hill, "A Neglected Manuscript."

⁴⁹ See T. Mari, "Martyrius," in the *Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics* (forthcoming).

⁵⁰ *Class. auct.* vol. III.

⁵¹ See the most recent edition and discussion by M. Cipriani, *Il De orthographia di L. Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius. Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commento* (PhD. Diss. Rome, 2009).

in fact printed until Cantor's edition of 1875,⁵² and then more completely from Clm 13084 by Moret in 1896.⁵³

It is not the case that Scipio Tettius set the agenda for the following three hundred and fifty years of Latin scholarship. Nonetheless, his *Index* offers us a bridge between the two ages of discovery, the Renaissance and the nineteenth century, which would bring new texts not only from palimpsests or neglected codices, but from papyri as well. In 1752, workers digging in Ercolano near Pompeii found, quite by accident, an ancient villa preserved from the ashes of Vesuvius' eruption in AD 79. On the floors and tables and shelves of it were ancient books, charred rolls. Eventually some 1806 rolls would be excavated from what came to be known as the *Villa dei Papiri*. Expectations ran wild once again regarding the total recovery of ancient literature. To tell the sequel is to go beyond the matter at hand, but let it suffice to note that what has actually been deciphered has been very different than what anyone expected. At the end of the nineteenth century, Egypt would begin to yield its papyrus fragments, restoring some of the lamented losses of Greek literature, such as Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* and the plays of Menander. Few Latin fragments have been discovered. Even so, the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have seen a steady stream on newly discovered texts from manuscripts, albeit often without much of an impact on the scholarly world.⁵⁴

No longer does discovery — or hope for discovery — play a central role in Latin scholarship. That is the legacy of the seventeenth century classical scholars we have discussed here. Following Tettius, and others, they began the project of seeing the transmitted heritage of antiquity as a whole — cataloguing the great collections of manuscripts, identifying the most ancient and correct codices, picking out little bits of flotsam, snatches of verse and prose, which eluded previous readers. What they

⁵² M. Cantor, *Die römischen Agrimensoren und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Feldmesskunst* (Leipzig 1875).

⁵³ V. Moret, *Un nouveau texte des traités d'arpentage et de géométrie d'Epaphroditus et de Vitruvius Rufus: publié d'après le Ms. latin 13084 de la Bibliothèque royale de Munich* (Paris 1896).

⁵⁴ See F. Dolbeau, "Découvertes récentes d'oeuvres latines littéraires inconnues," *Sacris Erudiri* 38 (1998/9), 101–42.

changed through these efforts was the way in which the scholarly world imagined the inheritance of antiquity, a finite inheritance, only partially recoverable, a globe whose continents at least were mapped.

Justin Stover

University of Edinburgh

justin.stover@ed.ac.uk